UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,706	04/27/2001	Arun Shah	68110328.713	9552

23562   7590   03/25/2003

BAKER & MCKENZIE
PATENT DEPARTMENT
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 2300
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 August 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. **DOV POPOVICI**
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>4, 5, & 7</u> .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in the abstract, line 1,

"disclosed" should be deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the
disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single
paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the
abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the
computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used
in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should
describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need
for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given
in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure
concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Weissman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,212,524) in view of Tse et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,282,544).

As to claims 1, and 6, <u>Weissman et al.</u> discloses a computer readable medium for storing a plurality of instructions for calculating a measure, said plurality of instructions (See column 56, lines 12-24, also see column 8, lines 1-20) comprising:

receiving a request to calculated a measure (See column 9, lines 18-28, wherein "request" reads on "query"), said measure associated with one or more requested levels (See column 1, lines 61-67, and see column 2, lines 1-11, wherein "level" reads on " reads on "supports queries at much higher level", and wherein "allocated" reads on "datamarts structure");

determining at least one allocated level for the measure (See column 1, lines 61-67, and see column 2, lines 1-11, wherein "level" reads on " reads on "supports queries at much higher level", and wherein "allocated" reads on "datamarts structure");

selecting a first star from a first stargroup associated with the measure (See column 6, lines 17-25), wherein the first star supports the at least one allocation level for the measure (See column 1, lines 61-67, and see column 2, lines 1-11, wherein "level" reads on " reads on "supports queries at much higher level", and wherein "allocated" reads on "datamarts structure").

<u>Weissman et al.</u> does not teach selecting a second star from a second stargroup associated with a control measure, wherein the second star supports the one or more requested levels.

<u>Tse et al.</u> teaches selecting a second star from a second stargroup (See column 8, lines 13-23, wherein "a second stargroup" reads on in "a different star schema") associated with a control measure (See column 3, lines 25-56, wherein "control measure" reads on "effective business management"), wherein the second star supports the one or

more requested levels (See column 19, lines 29-43, wherein "supports" reads on "in one shot" and wherein "request levels" reads on "participate... in...output").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Weissman et al. to include selecting a second star from a stargroup associated with a control measure, wherein the second star supports the one or more requested levels.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Weissman et al. by the teaching of Tse et al. to include selecting a second star from a stargroup associated with a control measure, wherein the second star supports the one or more requested levels because comparing and calculating measurements with a second stargroup representing a second database schema allows for different aggregates that are of interests to more than one group of users which will provide for resource savings and limit the scope of data accessible by users (See Tse et al. column 2, lines 60-67)

As to claims 2, and 7, Weissman et al. as modified discloses computer readable medium wherein the plurality of instructions (See column 55, lines 20-26) comprising determining at least one allocated level (See column 1, lines 61-67, and see column 2, lines 1-11, wherein "level" reads on " reads on "supports queries at much higher level", and wherein "allocated" reads on "datamarts structure") further comprises:

comparing the requested levels to a lowest level star in the first stargroup (See column 12, lines 24-40, wherein "comparing" reads on "indicating relationship"); and

selecting for each requested level, a minimum of the requested level and a

corresponding one of one or more dimension levels associated with the star (See column

28, lines 41-53, wherein "level" reads on "hierarchy", also see column 2, lines 14-25).

As to claims 3, and 8, Weissman et al. as modified discloses the computer

readable medium wherein the plurality of instructions (See column 55, lines 20-26)

further comprising:

calculating the measure for the allocated levels (See column 1, lines 61-67, and

see column 2, lines 1-11, wherein "level" reads on " reads on "supports queries at much

higher level", and wherein "allocated" reads on "datamarts structure"); and

calculating the control measure for the requested levels (See column 31, lines 22-

42, wherein "control measure" reads on "logical business calculation that can be

presented to the user....user filters information").

As to claims 4, and 9, Weissman et al. as modified discloses determining the

allocated levels (See column 1, lines 61-67, and see column 2, lines 1-11, wherein "level"

reads on " reads on "supports queries at much higher level", and wherein "allocated"

reads on "datamarts structure") further comprises:

determining the allocated levels wherein no star exists which supports the

measure at the requested levels (See Weissman et al. column 26, lines 4-42, also see Tse

et al. column 2, lines 7-35, wherein "no Star" reads on "not involved in the cross

product").

As to claims 5, and 10, <u>Weissman et al.</u> as modified discloses wherein the control

measure is a predetermined measure associated with the measure (See column 8, lines 54-

67, and see column 9, lines 1-29, wherein "predetermined" reads on "predefined", and

wherein "control measure" reads on "the filters allow the user to filter ...the forms allow

the users to indicate which fields a user is ...interested in").

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

<u>Lore et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,774) discloses flexible selection of aggregate

and cross product levels.

<u>Roccaforte</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,179) discloses storing multi-dimensional data.

<u>Colby et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,699) discloses precomputed views.

<u>Kothuri et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,205) discloses storing multidimensional data

in hierarchy.

<u>Rauer et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,103) discloses creating aggregates in datamart.

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-

8114. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone numbers for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for

regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-

3900.

Neveen Abel-Jalil
March 10, 2003

DOV POPOVICI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100